DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 104 SO 011 485

AUTHOR O'Toole, Tom
TITLE Culture and Development: From Romantic Relativism to Reality.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Second National Conference on the Third World (Omaha, Nebraska, November 16-18, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; Cultural Background; Cultural Differences; *Cultural Factors; *Cultural Interrelationships; Cultural Traits; *Culture Conflict; Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; Ethical Values; Futures (of Society); Industrialization; Non Western Civilization; Quality of Life; Social Exchange Theory; Social Values; Sociocultural Patterns; *Technological Advancement; *Theories; Western Civilization; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS Africa (West); Appalachia

ABSTRACT

Using case studies of French-speaking West Africa and Southern Appalachia, this paper examines the role of traditional culture in developing regions by challenging current theories on that subject. The capitalistic and Marxist approaches that dominated well into the 1960s maintained that elimination of traditional social relations and values was necessary for progress in underdeveloped areas. The strategy was to introduce modernizing influences which would transform local independence and self-sufficiency by integration into a market economy. Residents would internalize this perception and see progress in relation to urbanization. The romantic approach toward development which appeared in the 1960s and 1970s blamed external forces rather than native residents for the lack of development. This theory attributed underdevelopment to imperialist expansion by industrialized societies. However, it is important to note that underdevelopment would exist even without external exploitation. A synthesis of the capitalistic, Marxist, and romantic ideologies seems to be the best approach to understanding the relationship between traditional values and modernizing influences in developing areas. Balanced, humane development goals will be achieved by people who recognize, respect, and work with existing cultural values, but do not over-glamorize them. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160104

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom O'Toole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT:

From Romantic Relativism to Reality

by

Tom O'Toole
History Department
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC 28723
(Draft - Quote at your own discretion)

Second National Conference on the Third World
Omaha Hilton Hotel
November 16-18, 1978

CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT: FROM ROMANTIC RELATIVISM TO REALTY

The worst crime the white has ever committed was to teach us to hate ourselves.

-Malcolm X

Introduction

This essay is written by an ethnohistorian who came of age in the democratic, popular, progressive and socialist state of Guinea[1] and now lives in rural southern Appalachia. It was catalyzed by a Group Project Abroad grant funded by the Office of Education in the summer of 1978. This grant allowed the author and a colleague to lead a group of faculty from colleges and universities in the southeastern United States to French speaking West Africa to visit development projects and interview people directly involved in the development process. The group sought, through a comparison of the "developing areas" of Africa and Southern Appalachia to test the theory that Southern Appalachia as an "internal colony" or peripheral region within an advanced capitalist society might share many common development problems with the Third World.[2] At the conclusion of the trip it seemed that both the author and the other members of the group had learned much development, Francophone West Africa and themselves. But they were also far from certain whether Southern Appalachia and Africa shared any development dilemmas. They were even farther from certain whether the alternatives to modernization theory which had

originally sparked their curiosity were viable in either case.[3]

One insight did emerge from the exercise. As the author met and talked with African technicians, farmers, students, community leaders, teachers and university officials as well expatriate "development experts" it became increasingly clear that all development models are created as much by the intervening filters of the model builders as they are by the Third World realities to which they purport to address themselves. Such revelation is perhaps little more than a truism. But at least one crucial aspect of how intellectuals define reality and how power wielders shape the world to conform to such definitions does have some relevance to the lives of ordinary people in both Francophone West Africa and Southern Appalachia. It seems fairly obvious that both Southern Appalachia and Francophone West Africa experience various degrees of economic, political and cultural dependence on outside powers.[4] Though the realities of heterogenity and the dangers of a simplistic dualism between "traditional" and "modern" are not to be denied,[5] it can be maintained that people in these areas are somewhat more immersed in traditional rural communities than are the majority of development planners. As a consequence the perceptions held by model builders of the developmental role of traditional culture is a crucial element in the application of development models focused on these areas.

This essay will use a time worn pedagogical device - the Hegelian dialectic[6] - to more clearly present a very

involved paradigm shift in current thinking about the role of tradition in development. The thesis that tradition stands in the way of development will be shown to have been challenged by the antithesis that tradition is the key to development. Hopefully the conclusion will at least begin to call forth a synthesis which will be of some use to specialists in public health, education, agriculture and community development in both Southern Appalachia and Francophone West Africa. The "models" presented are not intended to give "proof" because much that is involved in this discussion is not susceptive to "proof". This essay is simply a first step on a path through the chaos of contending thought in regard to the role of traditional culture in development.

The Classic Thesis

The classic paradigms of economic development, whether capitalist or Marxist, which were dominant well into the 1960s maintained that the elimination of traditional social relations and values was necessary for progress. Capitalist economists maintained that modernizing influences would penetrate into otherwise backward economic and social settings either directly through integration into extraregional trading networks or through the creation of "modern enclaves" within Third World settings. These external inputs were then to serve as prime movers in the transformation of moribund

traditional economies. Integration into a market economy meant the disruption of traditional social, political and cultural patterns. Development activities and institutions were expected to radically change local independence and local self sufficiency. Commercialization and cash earning, literacy and education, and new technology were all expected to reduce household self sufficiency. The network of social relations which had once produced a local social security system would naturally be undermined by the demands of the market economy. And all of this externally induced change was perceived as good by those who espoused the capitalist views of development.

A similar rejection of traditional society was evident from the Marxian perspective. As Marx put it, only those recovered from "the idiocy of rural life" could be a source for social transformation.[7] Well into the 1960s non-Maoist Marxists continued to call for a revolutionary restructuring of traditional economic and social systems as a necessary stop in overcoming development problems in the Third World. Following Engels who wrote:

> The agricultural population. . . never can attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the town,[8]

these orthodox theoreticians felt that the total removal of traditional, pre-capitalist community structures in the agrarian sector was necessary for progressive change. In their view traditional society lacked the driving

power to develop productive forces and make social or economic changes. They held that this is due to the isolation of traditional society, its simple production organization and its "primitive" system of production and distribution. Not only were traditional societies perceived as an obstacle to the speedy economic development of Third World agriculture but

> . . .their economic and social isolation and narrowness, their fossilized social and political structures -- plus the ideology of the traditional community directed at the reproduction of what already exists -- also greatly impede an alliance with the mass of peasants and the penetration of revolutionary ideology into the villages.[9]

Thus, in interesting examples of "blaming the victim," the lack of development in both southern Appalachia and Africa could be perceived as stemming from the internal deficiencies of traditional culture patterns.[10] And as with other "victims" many rural residents of both Francophone West Africa and Southern Appalachia have internalized this perception of development. They have come to see progress in terms of how closely their lives can be made to resemble those of their urban cousins. New roads, new sewers or water systems, and new levels of employment are the measure of development. For some residents of rural villages, whether Jonas Ridge, North Carolina or Dafinso, Upper Volta, the move from the old two room cabin or grass thatched house into the new mobile home or zinc roofed and cement floored dwelling often seemed to be coterminous with the rejection of traditional cultures.

The Romantic Antithesis

As part of the intellectual climate of the 1960s and 1970s, part of the reaction to the Southeast Asian "police action", to emerging concepts of neo-colonialism, to the growing international importance of "Third World" nations, to America's difficulties in overcoming internal problems of racism and poverty, to a more generalized "back to the simple life" movement and to any number of other factors -- including guilt -- it has become "chic" among some social scientists and development workers to identify with and serve as advocates for the excluded peoples of the Third World including repressed internal minorities. Unfortunately some of these erstwhile advocates have then taken the well-worn path blazed by the literary romantic movements which reject urban life and modernization in favor of a supposed golden age of traditional village life.[11] This counter thrust against the denigration of traditional cultures has gradually come to assert that indigenous cultural patterns, rather than being obstacles to development, are a necessary vehicle for meaningful development. The evolution of such "discoveries" of the glory of traditional culture in Southern Appalachia and Africa are in themselves problems in the sociology of knowledge but for purposes of this essay causes will be considered less important than results.[12]

From John Campbell's rejection of any genetic basis for Appalachia poverty and backwardness in 1921[13] to the ringing affirmations of the beauties of mountain culture

put forth by some present day folklorists,[14] there has long been a romantic attempt to demonstrate the value of traditional mountain culture. A similar pattern can also be found in Africa. This ranges from Leopold Senghor's "négritude" attempts to re-establish his connections with his African past, nature and the supposed harmony of a traditional village[15] to contemporary intellectuals who infer that an awakened peasantry is the only foundation for development in Africa.[16]

In many of these cases romantic reaction simply takes the very means of ascribing inferior status put forth by colonizers and exploiters and turned them upside down -- transvaluing negative cultural attributes into positive ones.[17] The best examples of this analysis reify institutions such as the extended Appalachian and African families into integral parts of a "better" set of values which include equality, non-competitiveness, and family/village solidarity rather than perceiving them as useless survivals of an earlier tradition.[18] At its worst this reification of past cultural tradition disintegrates into "museum piece romanticism." In this approach idealized Appalachian and African histories and a myopic focus on arts and crafts excludes the living cultures of the area.[19] In neither case does it directly facilitate development.

Furthermore, and of more interest to those who seek answers to what causes underdevelopment and perpetuates it, a special form of this romantic paradigm has gained great

currency among Third World and other thinkers dissatisfied with the ethnocentricism of Western researchers.[20] A growing number of these economists and political theorists in poor countries over the past ten years have begun using the word "underdeveloped" to mean not an initial state, but a conditioned arrival through the agency of imperialism, which "sets up an 'internal' structure of underdevelopment."[21] They view underdevelopment as an active process in which the verb "underdevelop" changes from transitive passive to transitive active, namely "I underdevelop you."[22] One should not simply dismiss this growing literature on development because it often adopts a rather simplistic interpretation of capitalism, and alleges that underdevelopment was brought about solely by the colonial expropriation of the surplus value produced by rural populations. At its most vigorous these thinkers present historically documented antitheses to liberal classical development theory. These alternative theories of development have served a useful paradigm changing function. They have helped students of development in Africa free themselves from some of the fatalism which had come to dominate thinking on economic development in the late 1960s.[23] These "dependency theories" corrected the myopic vision of conventional modernization theories by positing that obstacles to development existed only within African societies but were also caused by the imperialist expansion of the core, industrialized, advanced capitalist and state socialist societies. According to these

new theorists the economic system has operated to the disadvantage of African development beginning with the Atlantic Slave Trade and continuing through raw materials exploitation and human subjugation of African peoples.

The application of a somewhat similar internal colonialism model to Appalachia helped explain the destruction of indigenous culture in the process of establishing and maintaining domination over the colonized group. It also performed a valuable service by focusing attention on the acquisition of the raw materials of the region by outside corporate interests and on the exploitation of the local work force and community at large resulting from the removal of the region's natural resources for the benefit of absentee owners.[24]

Obviously such blanket condemnations of outside exploitation fulfilled a very useful purpose in shattering liberal orthodoxy about the role of external intervention in development. Dependency theory and internal colonist models challenged the view that "Third World" areas can grown rich by seeking the most profitable outlets for their goods and by rearranging their social structures to maximize market production.

Yet many who espoused these theoretical breakthroughs easily fell prey to their own rhetoric. In positing a golden age before the instrusion of outside modernizers a subtle formof romantic blindness often replaced the negative views of traditional life held by mainstream social scientists. A sort of reverse Eurocentricism is inherent in works which place all the blame for African underdevelopment on the peri-

pheral relationships of these nations to the Euro-American industrial center. One does not have to search for "breakdown" which halted some inevitable march towards full development[25] in Africa to realize that plenty of structural, institutional, epidemiological, socio-demographic, technological and resource reasons for underdevelopment in most African countries would exist even without European exploitation. And although the internal colonialism model has raised important questions about wealth, power and exploitation in Appalachia the colonized populations of the Third World faced a substantially different situation than most Appalachians. The forces which have kept Appalachian people poor since the expansion of industrial capitalism may present better examples of class domination than colonial domination.[26] It is all well and good to stop blaming the victim but the simplistic positing of a romantic idyll of the past that has been destroyed by intervention does little to improve the present or the future.

Progressive Synthesis

In the contemporary context of both Francophone Africa and Southern Appalachia, one fact must be clearly grasped. Economic, social and political forces have already eroded any possible pristine traditional culture. From the most rural tradition bound subsistence farm in an isolated cove in Appalachia or the most remote bush village in Mali, a link to international markets, cash and wage labor already

exists. The link between these communities and their urban kin are very strong,[27] and no amount of rhetoric from well intentioned outsiders is going to convince the rural poor that a golden age of village isolation, self sufficiency and non-exploitation is right around the corner.[28]

On the other hand there is little evidence that the traditional mountain families ever felt helpless, dependent or inferior.[29] Southern Appalachian mountaineers are not descendants of a peasant people. They trace their origins to eighteenth century colonialists, most of whom had been landless wage-earners from an agricultural and mercantile capitalist nation on the brink of the industrial revolution. In sharp contrast to any supposed Gemeinsshaft solidarity of traditional society the Appalachian mountaineer has always been the quintessentian modern individualist. To see mountain communities as homogeneous entities is to ignore social status differentiation which influence interaction in mountain communities. The very real factors of inequality and power differentials have a great impact on social and economic mobility for mountain people.[30] Likewise contemporary West Africa is characterized by rapid urbanization and the rise of new towns and the revitalization of old ones, the building of harbors, roads, schools, hospitals, radio-TV stations and local participation in the now world-wide Tee shirt complex. For wide areas of West Africa this "modernization" process is a continuation of adjustment to world market systems which

anti-date colonial occupation.

As Fanon warned "one has to distrust rhythm, earth-mother love, the mystic carnal urge of the group and the cosmos." Although "the aboringinal cult is paid tribute by Western ethnologists. . .with sentimental affection" acceptance of such a pastoral idyl by Appalachians or Africans would mean that "the dynamics of social change are blocked."[31] Even in the late 1950s Fanon realized that neither the classic advocacy of instant industrialism nor the equally naive "back to the countryside" movements were viable.[32] Unfortunately Fanon was himself unable to transcend his own training as a French educated doctor and articulate litterateur. He persisted in the myopic view that only revolution could substantially improve the access of the rural poor to income and power, a view which became an obsession with too many intellectuals who were all too ready to sacrifice human life on the altar of their own ignorance.[33]

It is not the duty of urban politicians, teachers, social scientists, thinkers or visiting experts to lead rural revolutions. Yet only the inverted snob would suppose that the complex forms of organized thought by which the poorest rural people achieve a consciousness of their role in their own development can be achieved in local meetings without some help from the outside. Neither the separatist romantic who insists that a traditional golden age is to be sought, nor a neo-Marxist revolutionary who exploits the rural masses as a blind, inert force for change nor the capitalist who

insists that all tradition must be abolished have proven viable. Outsiders are probably necessary to help isolated and dispersed rural poor become aware of and organized against the force which oppress them. The normal kin based contact with the urban world will probably not help much in itself. Usually the successful outward migrant is captured by the city while the failure returns frustrated to the village. Neither is usually able to become an agent promoting rural awareness of the forces of urban exploitation. But the first step outsiders who wish to help must take is to involve themselves directly in rural life, by visiting and learning and then explaining. Whether given elements of traditional culture will prove useful in developing a more humane society cannot be solved by recourse to economic analysis of the international capitalist system, or for that matter, a meta-scientific conviction of the requirements of distributive justice. The key word would seem to be participation but only an approach which skirts the polarities of embracing participation as a self redemptive act or of rejecting participation as a romantic illusion will be of any use.

Those who are sincerely interested in helping the "rural excluded" and who give a high priority to participation in and preservation of positive aspects of traditional culture and economy must develop a new "grass roots" approach which synthesizes "modern" and "traditional" cultural patterns but avoid the romantic drop out syndrome which calls a plague on the whole panoply of modernity and development. For some the Chinese path to development would seem to offer useful

guidelines. It suggests that sustained development at both the national and local level must build on traditional institutions of organizing for production and distribution rather than destroying them. From this perspective development does not take place from the top down, external inputs, urban centers, party headquarters or leading "modern" industrial sectors. Rather, the classical Western patterns of industrialization are avoided, the rural areas are given priority, an egalitarian policy among regions and individuals in pursued, labor intensive technology in stressed and self reliance and human development are promoted.[34]

But for Southern Appalachia and Francophone Africa attempts to implement the sort of sweeping changes which followed the establishment of the People's Republic are probably not practical. Nations like Guinea-Bissau (where independence, nation-building and economic development have begun de nouveau since the resolution of their decade long war of liberation) are probably not very realistic models either.[35] Very pragmatically, attempts to launch any rural development schemes will have to take place within the existing structures. But even the World Bank seems to agree that in the Third World this must include some attention being paid to rural cultural patterns:

> Coordination at the local level is emphasized because of the growing evidence that multi-sectional programs can be implemented most effectively through a substantial increase in decentralization. Local control provides the flexibility needed for the proper integration

> and timing of activities, and for modification of programs in response to changing conditions. Community development involvement, which is essential to a sustained development process, is greatly facilitated by local rather than centralized control. One particular advantage is that the problems of the community, as perceived by its residents and those input by local officials, tend to be more easily reconciled.[36]

Unfortunately in Appalachia the major sociological works still tend to search out modernizing elites to serve as "cultural bridges between modern and traditional groups rather than acknowledging the possiblity that indigenous people and their cultural patterns can serve as vehicles for development."[37] Though a number of fieldworkers have come to the conclusion that:

> . . .it is necessary to have a group understand who they are before they can begin to decide what they want to do. Identity is as important to group cohesiveness in many cases as the issues around which the group is organized. Self-definition both economically and culturally must surely be a part of the organizing process for Appalachians. Community organizing can be expedited in many instances by cultural self consciousness, especially in those instances where discrimination is experienced.[38]

Conclusion

It seems quite apparent that decisions relating to development are ideologically loaded. An increasing dissatisfaction with both conventional Marxist thought and conventional capitalist thought on development is extensively revealed in the litterature. Yet it is equally obvious that attempts to re-evaluate indigenous cultural patterns and their importance in the development process

can easily disintegrate into a romantic panegyric of the supposed glories inherent in a largely non-existent "golden past".

It would seem obvious that every society must feel that its values are of some merit if its people are to develop the confidence to plan and carry out their own development Attempts to make people "modern", "efficient", and "technologically adept" can easily prove to be ethnocentrically destructive if one uncritically assumes that these qualities are unquestionably superior to the traditional patterns they are replacing. On the other hand poor hygiene or destructive cultural practices must not be preserved simply because they are quaint, time honored or "traditional". Any "folk loric" viewpoint on old values is banal if not positively counter productive while technocultural inputs which disdain people's self-image as puerile and obsolete will probably prove unsuccessful in the long run. Balanced humane development goals are pragmatically achieved by people who recognize, respect and work in harmony with existing culture values but do not over-glamorize them. This "dramatic discovery" only repeats George Foster's common sense approach (based on field experience) to the training of community development officers from twenty-five developing countries almost twenty years ago.[39] Plus ça change. . .

FOOTNOTES

[1]See the now dated but then current view of the "radical" view of the Democratic Party of Guinea and its leader Ahmed Sékou Touré in Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Political Ideology of the PDG," Présence Africaine XII (First Quarter, 1962), pp.30-41.

[2]See David S. Walls, "Central Appalachia: A Peripheral Region within an Advanced Capitalist Society," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare IV (Nov., 1976), pp. 232-246; and Giovani Arrighi and John S. Saul, Essays on the Political Economy of Africa (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973).

[3]See T. Oxall et al., Beyond the Sociology of Development Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa (London: Routledge, 1975).

[4]See, for example, various selections in Helen Lewis, et al, eds., The Colony of Appalachia (Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978) and such works as Samir Amin, "Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa," Journal of Modern African Studies X (1972), pp. 503-524.

[5]For an interesting discussion of the dangers inherent in this essentially simplistic dicotomy, see Samuel P. Huntington, "The Change to Change," Comparative Politics III (Apr., 1971), pp. 293-296, especially.

[6]This thesis-antithesis-synthesis pattern is used here simply as an heuristic device. The author claims no knowledge of Hegelian thought and comes to this "model" only by way of his general New Left flirtation with Marx and conflict theory. A criticism of this usage might easily parallel that made by Marx of Proudhon: "(he) has of the dialectic of Hegel nothing but the language," in The Poverty of Philosophy as quoted in Robert C. Tucker, The Marxian Revolutionary Idea (New York: W.W. Norton, 1970), p. 52.

[7]See David Mitrany, Marx Against the Peasant (New York: Cambrdige University Press, 1951).

[8]Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973), p. 307.

[9]Klaus Ernst, Tradition and Progress in the African Village: Non-Capitalist Transformation of Rural Communities in Mali (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), p. 19.

[10]See, for example, Norman A. Polansky, Robert Borgman and Christine De Saix, Roots of Futility (San Francisco: Jassey Bass, 1972); and Charles Elliot and Françoise de Morsier, Patterns of Poverty in the Third World (New York: Praeger, 1975), especially pp. 85-87; and Stephen L. Fisher, "Victim Blaming in Appalachia: Cultural Theories and the Southern Mountaineer," in Appalachia: Social Content Past and Present, Bruce Ergood and Bruce E. Kuhre, eds. (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1978), pp. 134-148.

[11]See the insightful critique of this literary influence in Michael Lipton, Why Poor People Stay Poor (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977), pp. 130-141.

[12]See Henry Shapiro, Appalachia on Our Minds (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1978); and Adelaide Cromwell Hill and Martin Kilson, eds., Apropos of Africa (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), for example.

[13]John C. Campbell, The Southern Highlander and His Homeland (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1921).

[14]For a critical review of such material, see W.K. McNeil, "Appalachian Folklore Scholarship," Appalachian Journal V (Autumn, 1977), pp. 55-64.

[15]See Abiola Irele, "Negritude or Black Cultural Nationalism," Journal of Modern African Studies III (1965), pp. 321-348.

[16]See, for example, Claude Ake, "Explanatory Notes on the Political Economy of Africa," Journal of Modern African Studies XIV (Mar., 1976), pp. 1-23.

[17]For a general objective and positive view of this process in Africa, see Melville J. Herskovits, The Human Factor in Changing Africa (New York: Random House, 1962), pp. 451-478. For Appalachia one can refer to Robert Cole, Migrants, Sharecroppers and Mountaineers (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).

[18]See, for example, Helen Lewis, Sue Kobak, and Linda Johnson, "Family, Religion and Colonialism in Central Appalachia; or Bury my Rifle at Big Stone Gap," in Growin' Up Country, Jim Axelrod, ed. (Clintwood, VA: Council of the Southern Mountains, 1973), pp. 131-156; and P.C. Lloyd, "The Family," in Africa in Social Change (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 171-192.

[19]See Gunnar Myrdal, "The Case Against Romantic Ethnicity," The Center Magazine VII (July-Aug., 1974), pp. 26-30; and David Walls, "Appalachian Problems are National Problems," Appalachian Journal IV (Autumn, 1976), pp. 42.

[20]That Western paradigms of modernization and development are ethnocentric should need little proof but for further insight into the widespread and all pervasive nature of the view in the United States, see Paul A. Laudicina, World Poverty and Development: A Survey of American Opinion (Washington, DC: Overseas Development Council, 1973).

[21]Andre Gunder Frank, Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), p. xxi.

[22]See Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House, 1972); Tamás Szentes, The Political Economy of Underdevelopment, Part II (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1971); and Peoples' Appalachia, the entire issue (Aug. -Sept., 1970) which was organized around the theme, "The Developers: Partners in Colonization."

[23]For a very valuable example, René Dumont, False Start in Africa, 2nd ed. rev., Phyllis Nauts Ott, trans. (New York: Praeger, 1969).

[24]See, for example, S.N. Eisenstadt, "Breakdowns of Modernization," Economic Development and Cultural Change XXII (July, 1964), pp. 345-367; and Samuel Huntington, "Political Development and Political Decay," World Politics XVII (Apr., 1965), pp. 386-430.

[26]Walls, 1976.

[27]See Peoples' Appalachia (July, 1972) issue on urban migrants and the special issue of Mountain Life and Work (Aug., 1976) on urban Appalachia; and Sara S. Berry, "Economic Change in Contemporary Africa," in Africa, Phyllis M. Martin and Patrick O'Meara, eds. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977), p. 262 ff.

[28]Yet some Africans and many development experts do ". . .perpetuate the myth of Africa as an underpopulated continent with inexhaustible resources," See Timothy Shaw and Malcolm T. Grieve, "The Political Economy of Resources: Africa Future in the Global Environment," Journal of Modern African Studies XVI (1978), p. 18. For Southern Appalachian parallels see The Mother Earth News (PO Box 70, Hendersonville, North Carolina, 28739)

[29]See Harry K. Schwarzweller, James S. Brown and J.J. Mangalam, Mountain Families in Transition: A Case Study of Appalachia Migration (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1971), p. 63.

[30]This paragraph is essentially taken from David S. Walls and Dwight S. Billings, "The Sociology of Southern Appalachia," Appalachian Journal V (Autumn, 1977), p. 135

[31]D. Caute, Fanon (New York: Fontana Collins, 1970), pp. 22 and 25

[32]Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1965), pp. 95,126,138 and 152-154.

[33]See the wise advice of Saul Alinsky, Rules for Radicals (New York: Vintage Books, Randon House, 1972), pp. xxi-xxii.

[34]See E.L. Wheelwright and Bruce McFarlane, The Chinese Road to Socialism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970)

[35]But for a taste of the excitement of the possibilities, see Paulo Freire, Pedagogy in Process: The Letters to Guinea-Bissau (New York: Seabury Press, 1978).

[36](World Bank), The Assault on World Poverty (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1978), p. 7, emphasis added.

[37]See H. Dudley Plunkett and Mary Jean Bowman, Elites and Change in the Kentucky Mountains (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1973).

[38]Phillip Obermiller, "Appalachians as an Urban Ethnic Group: Romanticism, Renaissance, or Revolution," Appalachian Journal V (Autumn, 1977), p. 148, emphasis added.

[39]George M. Foster, Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).